

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 16-25, 27-29, 31-42, 44-49, 51-62 and 64-66 are pending. Each of claims 1, 23, 27, 31, 47 and 51 (i.e., each of the independent claims) has been amended to recite that the non-hierarchical clustering result summary table contains no search results. This amendment is fully supported by the disclosure (see, e.g., Fig. 16 and the accompanying description in the specification) and further distinguishes the claimed invention over the cited references, most notably the combination of *Tso* and *Zamir*.

Initially, applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview with the undersigned on January 11, 2005. During the interview, the undersigned pointed out what he believes to be the differences between the clustering process of *Zamir* and that of the subject invention. The undersigned explained that in *Zamir's* process some but not all search results assigned to a particular cluster are shown, as evidenced by Fig. 2 of *Zamir*.

Extending this argument, it can be seen that the table shown in Fig. 2 of *Zamir* meets neither applicants' claimed clustering result, which comprises all of the search results of each of the plurality of clusters, nor the claimed non-hierarchical clustering result summary table, which contains no search results. Consequently, *Zamir* also fails to show or teach a clustering process in which a clustering result (containing all search results of the clusters) and a non-hierarchical clustering result summary table (containing no search results) is output together, as specified in each of the independent claims.

Tso's search result generation/presentation process does not remedy the shortcomings in *Zamir*. *Tso* shows the presentation of only clustered search results; no summary table, non-hierarchical or otherwise, is generated.

Moreover, there is no suggestion in either of these references to generate both a clustering result and a non-hierarchical summary table, as specified by the claims, and to output these items together, as further specified by the claims. In fact, *Zamir* actually teaches away from the claimed process by showing what is really a hybrid of a summary table and clustering results. It is too detailed to

be a summary table and not detailed enough to be a clustering result, as those items are defined by the claims herein.

Mukherjea, which is applied against independent claims 31, 47 and 51, is even less relevant to applicants' claimed invention than either of the two references discussed above, and certainly does not overcome the deficiencies of the *Tso/Zamir* combination.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this Response After Final Rejection places this application in condition for allowance, and does so without raising any new issue. Entry of this Response is therefore proper pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.116. Should the Examiner believe that any issue(s) remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issue(s) and advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael T. Gabrik
Registration No. 32,896

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Customer No. 20178
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: February 3, 2005